



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,618	06/27/2003	Outi Markki	4208-4139	8020

27123 7590 09/22/2004  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER  
NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101

EXAMINER

MEUCCI, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/607,618

Applicant(s)

MARKKI ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D Meucci

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-62 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 32 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 1 and 32 objected to because of the following informalities: Applicant specifies "said user to" twice on line 7 of claim 1 and line 12 of claim 32. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

a. For the purpose of applying art, it will be presumed that any mention of the user interface in an idle state (line 5 of the claim) is meant to be regarded as in a standby mode. Clarification of the matter is required.

Art Unit: 2142

b. Lines 4-5 of the claim specify: "wherein displaying is performed while a user interface of said node is in an idle state." Examiner believes applicant meant to specify "wherein displaying is performed upon interruption of the interface of said node being in an idle state." Appropriate correction is required.

c. Line 6 of the claim specifies: "freezing display..." For the purpose of applying art, it will be presumed that "freezing display..." is meant to disclose the notification appearing on the display without changing until the user acts upon the notification in any manner. Clarification of the matter is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 15, 32-35, 37, 39, 41, and 46 rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Skladman et al. (U.S. 6,400,810 B1).

a. As per claim 1, Skladman teaches: displaying to said user, in accordance with one or more specified criteria, one or more notifications corresponding to one or more events known by a node of said user, wherein each of said notifications describes one or more of said events (abstract); displaying performed while user interface of said node is in an idle state (lines 37-40 of

Art Unit: 2142

column 3); freezing display of said notifications (lines 24-47 of column 3); and enabling said user to select one or more of said notifications for corresponding operations (lines 42-48 of column 1).

b. As per claims 2 and 33, Skladman teaches: one or more of said events relate to software accessible by said node (line 48 of column 3 through line 34 of column 4).

c. As per claims 3 and 34, Skladman teaches: one or more of said events relate to one or more messages received by said node (abstract).

d. As per claims 4 and 35, Skladman teaches: one or more of said messages correspond to one or more entities (lines 49-62 of column 1 and lines 21-34 of column 2).

e. As per claims 6 and 37, Skladman teaches: two or more of said notifications are displayed simultaneously to said user (lines 44-49 of column 6 and Fig. 5).

f. As per claims 8 and 39, Skladman teaches: one or more of said notifications are textual notifications (lines 42-48 of column 1).

g. As per claims 10 and 41, Skladman teaches: said criteria are provided by said user (lines 21-34 of column 2).

h. As per claims 15 and 46, Skladman teaches: activating software corresponding to a selected notification (lines 20-34 of column 4).

i. As per claim 32, Skladman teaches: memory, processor, and program code (inherent in computerized e-mail system); displaying to said user, in

accordance with one or more specified criteria, one or more notifications corresponding to one or more events known by a node of said user, wherein each of said notifications describes one or more of said events (abstract); freezing display of said notifications (lines 24-47 of column 3); and enabling said user to select one or more of said notifications for corresponding operations (lines 42-48 of column 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 5 and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman as applied to claims 3 and 34 respectively, in view of Kaars (U.S. PG Pub. 2002/0059384 A1).

Skladman fails to teach one or more of said messages correspond to chat. However, Kaars discloses: "A user who has installed an IM program is set up for a communications service that enables to create a private chat room with another individual," (paragraph [0005] on page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have messages corresponding to chat. "A chat room is a channel that creates a peer-to-peer communication data path, e.g., for text messaging or (PC) video conferencing. Typically, the instant messaging system alerts the user

whenever another individual on the user's private chat list is online. The user can then initiate a chat session with that particular individual," (paragraph [0005] on page 1 in Kaars). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said messages correspond to chat in the system as taught by Skladman.

9. Claims 7 and 38 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman as applied to claims 1 and 32 respectively, in view of Reed et al. (U.S. 5,862,325) hereinafter referred to as Reed.

Skladman fails to teach displaying via a screensaver. However, Reed discloses: "Notification methods may trigger any method operation available to the consumer program 22. Other examples include sending messages to other applications running on the consumer machine 2; sending messages to the consumer's operating system to trigger dialog boxes or trigger other system events; creating or controlling a screensaver display on the consumer machine 2; creating or controlling a background desktop graphic or set of graphics on the consumer machine 2; and sending voicemail to the recipient," (lines 17-26 of column 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to display via a screensaver. "Notification methods 141 can also be assigned to communications objects as a whole. For example, notification about new communications objects can be controlled through a NewObjectNotify method of the global preferences instance (103, FIG. 3). Described further above, the use of the NewObjectNotify method is illustrated in steps 704-706 of FIG. 15. Notification at the

object level is also useful for certain communications object updates,” (lines 30-37 of column 66 in Reed). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to display via a screensaver in the system as taught by Skladman.

10. Claims 9 and 40 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman as applied to claims 1 and 32 respectively, in view of Reed.

Skladman fails to teach one or more of said notifications are graphical notifications. However, Reed discloses: “Notification methods may trigger any method operation available to the consumer program 22. Other examples include sending messages to other applications running on the consumer machine 2; sending messages to the consumer's operating system to trigger dialog boxes or trigger other system events; creating or controlling a screensaver display on the consumer machine 2; creating or controlling a background desktop graphic or set of graphics on the consumer machine 2; and sending voicemail to the recipient,” (lines 17-26 of column 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have one or more of said notifications as graphical notifications. “Notification methods 141 can also be assigned to communications objects as a whole. For example, notification about new communications objects can be controlled through a NewObjectNotify method of the global preferences instance (103, FIG. 3). Described further above, the use of the NewObjectNotify method is illustrated in steps 704-706 of FIG. 15. Notification at the object level is also useful for certain communications object updates,” (lines 30-37 of column 66 in Reed). It is for this reason that one of ordinary



Art Unit: 2142

skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said notifications as graphical notifications in the system as taught by Skladman.

11. Claims 11 and 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman as applied to claims 1 and 32 respectively, in view of Dillon (U.S. 6,067,561).

Skladman fails to teach criteria provided by a system administrator. However, Dillon discloses: "Moreover, the e-mail notification may also be used to indicate to an e-mail alert service subscriber that his e-mail alert account is 'blocked' or disabled for administrative reasons," (lines 15-18 of column 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have criteria provided by a system administrator. "In other words, an e-mail account is said to be blocked when the e-mail alert system simply will not provide the e-mail alert service subscriber with e-mail notifications," (lines 19-22 of column 4 in Dillon). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have criteria provided by a system administrator in the system as taught by Skladman.

12. Claims 12 and 43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman as applied to claims 1 and 32, in view of Reed.

Skladman fails to teach one or more of said criteria are metadata. However, Reed discloses: "Service objects and partner servers provide specialized data, metadata, and methods to providers and consumers to automate many common

Art Unit: 2142

communications services and transactions useful to both providers and consumers," (abstract).

It would have been obvious to have one or more of said criteria as metadata. "A combination of the provider and consumer programs and databases allows for additional functionality, including coordination of multiple users for a single database," (abstract of Reed). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said criteria as metadata in the system as taught by Skladman.

13. Claims 13-14 and 44-45 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman as applied to claims 1 and 32 respectively, in view of McKinley (U.S. 4,926,326).

Skladman fails to teach scrolling notifications and three-dimensional scrolling. However, McKinley discloses: "the message may silently crawl, pause, sequence, scroll up and down, zoom, blink, wipe on, and Venetian to mention other alternatives," (lines 37-39 of column 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have scrolling notifications and three-dimensional scrolling. "The message display system of the present invention is not only beneficial to the individual member of the general public of local user, but also may provide some entertainment and a form of amusement," (lines 14-17 of column 4 in McKinley). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention

would have been motivated to have scrolling notifications and three-dimensional scrolling in the system as taught by Skladman.

14. Claims 16 and 47 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman as applied to claims 1 and 32 respectively, in view of Wong et al. (U.S. 5,542,115) hereinafter referred to as Wong.

Skladman fails to teach providing a tactile indication to said user. However, Wong discloses: "if pager unit 22 is in a vibrate mode, microprocessor 80 outputs a signal which causes I/O interface 86 to issue a further signal to activate vibrator 95 (step 322)," (lines 58-61 of column 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to provide a tactile indication to said user. "Notification to the user (either via beeper 94 and/or vibrator 95)" is the motivation for the addition of a tactile indication (lines 65-66 of column 7). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to provide a tactile indication to said user in the system as taught by Skladman.

15. Claims 17-18, 20, 22, 24, 29-30, 48-49, 51, 53, 55, and 60-61 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier et al. (US PG Pub. 2003/0041265 A1) hereinafter referred to as Lagimonier.

a. As per claims 17 and 48, Skladman teaches: memory, processor, and program code (inherent in computerized e-mail system); receiving from one of said nodes, one or more messages to be bypassed (abstract); displaying to said user one or more notifications corresponding to one or more of said messages to be bypassed

Art Unit: 2142

wherein each of the messages to be bypassed to which said notifications correspond matches one or more specified criteria, wherein each of said notifications describes one or more of messages to which said notifications correspond (abstract); maintaining, receiving, and displaying are performed while a user interface of said node is in an idle state (lines 37-40 of column 3).

Skladman fails to teach: maintaining a number of authenticated connections to one or more nodes in said peer-to-peer environment. However, Lagimonier discloses: "Yet another aspect of the present invention provides for a system for processing messages in a peer-to-peer configuration. The system comprises a first peer configured to provide secure communication, a second peer configured to provide secure communication, and a secure communication module, where the secure communication module is configured to be executed by the first peer and second peer," (paragraph [0015] on page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to maintain a number of authenticated connections to one or more nodes in said peer-to-peer environment. "The secure communication module is configured to compare the nonce value to a filter in response to a nonce value of a received packet not exceeding a largest nonce value yet seen and the secure communication module is also configured to compare the nonce value to a replay mask. The secure communication module is further configured to accept the received packet in response to the comparison of the nonce value and the replay mask being false," (paragraph [0015] on page 2 in Lagimonier). It is for this reason that one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to maintain a number of authenticated connections to one or more nodes in said peer-to-peer environment in the system as taught by Skladman.

b. As per claims 18 and 49, Skladman teaches one or more of the received messages to be bypassed correspond to one or more entities (abstract).

c. As per claims 20 and 51, Skladman teaches: two or more of said notifications are displayed simultaneously to said user (lines 44-49 of column 6 and Fig. 5).

d. As per claims 22 and 53, Skladman teaches: one or more of said notifications are textual notifications (lines 42-48 of column 1).

e. As per claims 24 and 55, Skladman teaches: said criteria are provided by said user (lines 21-34 of column 2).

f. As per claims 29 and 60, Skladman teaches: freezing display of said notifications (lines 24-47 of column 3); and enabling said user to select one or more of said notifications for corresponding operations (lines 42-48 of column 1).

g. As per claims 30 and 61, Skladman teaches: activating software corresponding to a selected notification (lines 20-34 of column 4).

16. Claims 19 and 50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier as applied to claims 17 and 48 respectively, further in view of Kaars

Skladman and Lagimonier fail to teach one or more of said messages correspond to chat. However, Kaars discloses: "A user who has installed an IM

Art Unit: 2142

program is set up for a communications service that enables to create a private chat room with another individual," (paragraph [0005] on page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have messages corresponding to chat. "A chat room is a channel that creates a peer-to-peer communication data path, e.g., for text messaging or (PC) video conferencing. Typically, the instant messaging system alerts the user whenever another individual on the user's private chat list is online. The user can then initiate a chat session with that particular individual," (paragraph [0005] on page 1 in Kaars). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said messages correspond to chat in the system as taught by Skladman and Lagimonier.

17. Claims 21 and 52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier as applied to claims 17 and 48 respectively, further in view of Reed.

Skladman and Lagimonier fail to teach displaying via a screensaver. However, Reed discloses: "Notification methods may trigger any method operation available to the consumer program 22. Other examples include sending messages to other applications running on the consumer machine 2; sending messages to the consumer's operating system to trigger dialog boxes or trigger other system events; creating or controlling a screensaver display on the consumer machine 2; creating or controlling a background desktop graphic or set of graphics on the consumer machine 2; and sending voicemail to the recipient," (lines 17-26 of column 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to display via a screensaver. "Notification methods 141 can also be assigned to communications objects as a whole. For example, notification about new communications objects can be controlled through a NewObjectNotify method of the global preferences instance (103, FIG. 3). Described further above, the use of the NewObjectNotify method is illustrated in steps 704-706 of FIG. 15. Notification at the object level is also useful for certain communications object updates," (lines 30-37 of column 66 in Reed). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to display via a screensaver in the system as taught by Skladman and Lagimonier.

18. Claims 23 and 54 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier as applied to claims 17 and 48 respectively, further in view of Reed.

Skladman and Lagimonier fail to teach one or more of said notifications are graphical notifications. However, Reed discloses: "Notification methods may trigger any method operation available to the consumer program 22. Other examples include sending messages to other applications running on the consumer machine 2; sending messages to the consumer's operating system to trigger dialog boxes or trigger other system events; creating or controlling a screensaver display on the consumer machine 2; creating or controlling a background desktop graphic or set of graphics on the consumer machine 2; and sending voicemail to the recipient," (lines 17-26 of column 66).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have one or more of said notifications as graphical notifications. "Notification methods 141 can also be assigned to communications objects as a whole. For example, notification about new communications objects can be controlled through a NewObjectNotify method of the global preferences instance (103, FIG. 3). Described further above, the use of the NewObjectNotify method is illustrated in steps 704-706 of FIG. 15. Notification at the object level is also useful for certain communications object updates," (lines 30-37 of column 66 in Reed). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said notifications as graphical notifications in the system as taught by Skladman and Lagimonier.

19. Claims 25 and 56 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier as applied to claims 17 and 48 respectively, further in view of Dillon.

Skladman and Lagimonier fail to teach criteria provided by a system administrator. However, Dillon discloses: "Moreover, the e-mail notification may also be used to indicate to an e-mail alert service subscriber that his e-mail alert account is 'blocked' or disabled for administrative reasons," (lines 15-18 of column 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have criteria provided by a system administrator. "In other words, an e-mail account is said to be blocked when the e-mail alert system simply will not provide the e-mail alert service subscriber with e-mail notifications," (lines 19-22 of



column 4 in Dillon). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have criteria provided by a system administrator in the system as taught by Skladman and Lagimonier.

20. Claims 26 and 57 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier as applied to claims 17 and 48 respectively, further in view of Reed.

Skladman and Lagimonier fail to teach one or more of said criteria are metadata. However, Reed discloses: "Service objects and partner servers provide specialized data, metadata, and methods to providers and consumers to automate many common communications services and transactions useful to both providers and consumers," (abstract).

It would have been obvious to have one or more of said criteria as metadata. "A combination of the provider and consumer programs and databases allows for additional functionality, including coordination of multiple users for a single database," (abstract of Reed). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have one or more of said criteria as metadata in the system as taught by Skladman and Lagimonier.

21. Claims 27-28 and 58-59 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier as applied to claims 17 and 48 respectively, further in view of McKinley.

Skladman and Lagimonier fail to teach scrolling notifications and three-dimensional scrolling. However, McKinley discloses: "the message may silently crawl,

Art Unit: 2142

pause, sequence, scroll up and down, zoom, blink, wipe on, and Venetian to mention other alternatives,” (lines 37-39 of column 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have scrolling notifications and three-dimensional scrolling. “The message display system of the present invention is not only beneficial to the individual member of the general public of local user, but also may provide some entertainment and a form of amusement,” (lines 14-17 of column 4 in McKinley). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have scrolling notifications and three-dimensional scrolling in the system as taught by Skladman and Lagimonier.

22. Claims 31 and 62 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Skladman in view of Lagimonier as applied to claims 17 and 48 respectively, further in view of Wong.

Skladman and Lagimonier fail to teach providing a tactile indication to said user. However, Wong discloses: “if pager unit 22 is in a vibrate mode, microprocessor 80 outputs a signal which causes I/O interface 86 to issue a further signal to activate vibrator 95 (step 322),” (lines 58-61 of column 7)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to provide a tactile indication to said user. “Notification to the user (either via beeper 94 and/or vibrator 95)” is the motivation for the addition of a tactile indication (lines 65-66 of column 7). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 2142

art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to provide a tactile indication to said user in the system as taught by Skladman and Lagimonier.

**Conclusion**

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kikinis (U.S. 5,631,847) discloses system for network file server failure notification.

Shaffer et al. (U.S. 6,094,681) discloses apparatus and method for automated event notification.

Ogasawara (U.S. 6,065,044) discloses home page update notification.

Helfman et al. (U.S. 6,396,513 B1) discloses electronic message sorting and notification system.

Kikugawa (U.S. 6,438,632 B1) discloses electronic bulletin board system.

Barchi (U.S. 6,507,866 B1) discloses e-mail usage pattern detection.

Sedlar (U.S. 6,549,916 B1) discloses event notification system tied to a file system.

Johnson (U.S. 6,591,310 B1) discloses method of responding to I/O request and associated reply descriptor.

Suzuki (US 2002/0007401 A1) discloses mail-arrival notification and monitoring system.

Sandhu et al. (U.S. 2002/0145561 A1) discloses method and system for a plurality of mobile unit to locate one another.

Henderson et al. (U.S. 2002/0178087 A1) discloses internet-based instant messaging hybrid peer-to-peer distributed electronic commerce system and method.

LaVallee et al. (U.S. 2004/0039781 A1) discloses peer-to-peer contest sharing method and system.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (703) 305-1382, or at (571) 272-3899 after October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2004. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack Harvey, can be reached at (703) 305-9705, or at (571) 272-3896 after October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2004. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-5358.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Application/Control Number: 10/607,618

Page 20

Art Unit: 2142

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

  
JACK B. HARVEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

---